

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,963	10/19/2004	Jun Iijima	04733/LH	8469
1933 7590 09/12/2007 FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 Fifth Avenue			EXAMINER	
			MEYERS, JAMES A	
16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2622		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/511,963	IIJIMA, JUN
		Examiner	Art Unit
		James A. Meyers	2622
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become AB ANDONE	N. nely filed the maiting date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ju. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,15-17 and 19-23 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,15-17 and 19-23 is/are rejecte Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicati	on Papers		
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2007 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachmen			
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment dated June 19, 2007. Claims 4-5, 10-14 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 15-17 and 19-23 are pending and have been considered below.

Drawings

1. Based on the amendment dated June 19, 2007, all objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20: The Examiner considers the phrase "together with" indistinct. One of ordinary skill would not understand what Applicant is claiming as the invention. The claim will be examined as reading "... a control unit which stops playback control of the moving image when the designated time position is reached."

Application/Control Number: 10/511,963

Art Unit: 2622

Claim 21: The Examiner considers the phrase "which shifts to a new photography" unclear. One of ordinary skill would not understand what Applicant is claiming as the invention. The claim will be examined as reading "...a photographing control unit which shifts to a new mode of photography based on the designation...."

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 15-17 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Takashi</u> (JP 11-339446) in view of Aki et al. (JP 10-191248).

Claims 1, 7 and 15: Takashi discloses a method, device and medium for editing images comprising designating an arbitrary time position in moving image data (page 18, paragraphs 141-148) and overwriting newly photographed image data at the arbitrary time position in the moving image data when the time position is designated (page 18, paragraphs 141-148). Takashi does not disclose displaying the designated time position in correspondence with a bar of the moving image data, or that the newly photographed image data can be inserted instead of overwritten. Aki discloses displaying the designated time position in correspondence with a bar of the moving image (figure 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Application/Control Number: 10/511,963

Art Unit: 2622

the art at the time of invention that the method of <u>Takashi</u> could also represent the moving image data with a bar. One would have been motivated to do so to give the user a better visual representation of their location in the moving image data before inserting the newly photographed image. <u>Aki</u> also discloses that newly photographed images can be inserted instead of overwriting previous image data (page 7, paragraph 38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the method of <u>Takashi</u> could insert the new images instead of overwriting. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure that no old image data was lost.

Claims 2, 8 and 16: Takashi and Aki disclose a method, device and medium as in Claims 1, 7 and 15 above, and Aki further discloses that the designating comprises designating a plurality of arbitrary time positions (page 7, paragraphs 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that multiple times could be designated in the method, device and medium of Takashi. One would have been motivated to do so to more rapidly insert the new data without needing to stop repeatedly to designate new time positions after a previous insertion.

Claims 3, 9 and 17: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a method, device and medium as in Claims 1, 7 and 15 above, and <u>Aki</u> further discloses that the designating comprises designating a plurality of arbitrary time positions and a photographing order (page 7,

Art Unit: 2622

paragraphs 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that multiple times could be designated in a predetermined order in the method, device and medium of <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been motivated to do so to more rapidly insert the new data without needing to stop repeatedly to designate new time positions after a previous insertion. <u>Aki</u> also discloses inserting the new images at the respective time positions of the movie according to the order designated (page 7, paragraphs 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that new images could be inserted at the respective time positions instead of overwritten, as taught by <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure that no original image data was lost.

Claim 19: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 1 above, and <u>Takashi</u> further discloses a playback control unit which plays back and controls the moving image data (page 18, paragraphs 141-148) and that the designation unit designates the time position with respect to the moving image data played back and controlled by the playback control unit (page 18, paragraphs 141-148).

Claim 20: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 19 above, and <u>Aki</u> further discloses a control unit which stops playback control of the moving image data together with the designation of the time position (page 7, paragraph 38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that such a unit could also be present in the device of <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been

Art Unit: 2622

motivated to add such a unit to the device of <u>Takashi</u> to allow the user to prepare to photograph the new images before the photographing occurs, rather than starting the new photographing immediately.

Claim 21: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 1 above, and <u>Takashi</u> further discloses a photographing control unit which shifts to a new mode of photography based on the designation of the time position (page 18, paragraph 141).

Claim 6: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 21 above, and <u>Takashi</u> further discloses that the image data obtained by the new photography is one of moving image data and still image data (figure 11).

Claim 22: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 1 above, and <u>Takashi</u> further discloses that the image data is moving image data (figure 11). While <u>Takashi</u> only discloses that the image data overwrites the previous image data, <u>Aki</u> discloses that new images can be inserted into the old data (page 7, paragraphs 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of intention that moving image data could be inserted with the device of <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been motivated to do so to produce a cut sequence, well known in the movie editing art.

Claim 23: <u>Takashi</u> and <u>Aki</u> disclose a device as in Claim 1 above, and but do not disclose that the new image data is still image data. However, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that both still and movie data could be used in the device of <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been motivated to do so to essentially freeze an image in the movie without hitting pause, allowing a viewer additional time before resuming the movie. While <u>Takashi</u> only discloses that the image data overwrites the previous image data, <u>Aki</u> discloses that new images can be inserted into the old data (page 7, paragraphs 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of intention that still image data could be inserted with the device of <u>Takashi</u>. One would have been motivated to do so to produce a freeze frame, well known in the movie editing art.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2622

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Meyers whose telephone number is (571) 270-1690. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NgocYen Vu can be reached on (571) 272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

8/28/2007 JM

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER